

**Draft Summary of the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group Meeting  
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)  
February 19, 2002**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted a meeting for the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group on February 19, 2002 in Sacramento.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting. The following are attachments to this summary:

Attachment 1	Meeting Agenda
Attachment 2	Meeting Attendees
Attachment 3	Flip Chart Notes
Attachment 4	Oroville Relicensing Land Use Studies: An unofficial examination of why we need the baseline data we are proposing to gather.

### **Introduction**

Attendees were welcomed to the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group meeting. Several people participated in the meeting via conference call. Attendees introduced themselves and their affiliations. The meeting agenda and list of meeting attendees are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively. Meeting flip chart notes are included as Attachment 3.

### **Action Items – January 31, 2002 Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group Meeting**

A summary of the January 31, 2002 Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group meeting is posted on the relicensing web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from that meeting as follows:

- Action Item #LU27:** Obtain Butte County Bicycle Plan for inclusion in SP-L3.  
Status: Jim Martin (DWR) reported that Jim Upholt (DWR) has attempted to get the Butte County Bicycle Plan and contacted the local city planning department regarding bicycle routes but to date, has not obtained a copy of this plan. DWR will follow-up on this issue and coordinate with Rob MacKenzie if necessary.
- Action Item #LU30:** Discuss implementation plans for critical-path studies, specifically SP-L1.  
Status: Mark Greenig (EDAW) informed the Work Group that implementation plans have not been developed for SP-L1 or for any other Land Use studies. The entire set of study plans is not advanced sufficiently to provide cost/hours information. There were concerns voiced with respect to the lack of sufficient implementation detail in the Land Use studies prior to submittal to the Plenary Group for approval. The Facilitator informed the Work Group that the Plenary Group was responsible for review of policy decisions and not with implementation details that were yet to be developed at the Work Group and Task Force level. The Plenary Group identified no “heartburn” policy issues for the Critical-path Land Use studies. Further, Mark Greenig indicated that the existing level of detail in the study plans is appropriate for implementation, and that the study plans would be coordinated with other Work Groups and study plans, including scheduling and GIS efforts, as necessary.

## **Implementation Concepts for Critical Path Study Plans**

In lieu of discussing specific implementation details for the Land Use studies, Mark Greenig (EDAW) led a discussion explaining the justification/nexus for what will be analyzed in the Land Use studies; a handout covering this topic was provided to the Work Group (see Attachment 4). Generally, the content of the study plans is based on FERC and/or NEPA/CEQA requirements. The purpose here is to meet legal requirements, maintain a reasonable budget for the licensing process, and ensure that enhancement measures can be identified once the studies are complete.

The discussion on SP-L1 included a description of land use alternatives and how changes to land uses would be addressed in the environmental document. No alternatives to the project have been identified to date. During review of SP-L2, participants discussed the need to address both ongoing and future management plans. SP-L3 differs from SP-L2 by evaluating the consistency of the Oroville Facilities with the comprehensive management plans of others within the study area. FERC has identified four plans to be included in this study, but this list is not intended to be complete; it represents only those plans that have been submitted to FERC by individual agencies. A more detailed list of plans will be developed prior to study implementation. A participant pointed out that this study couldn't analyze plan consistency until it knows what actions/projects will result from the relicensing process as determined by the results of other Work Group studies. In response, Mark Greenig suggested that the Land Use Work Group needs to track this information, in effect serving as a "clearinghouse" for this type of information. The Facilitator also explained that FERC does not want to license projects that are inconsistent with applicable local plans.

Mark Greenig explained that SP-L4 is driven by NEPA/CEQA requirements, public comments, and the FERC process. He further explained that, for the most part, although the Land Use Work Group may suggest and examine options for improving the aesthetic quality of the project, the primary focus of the LUWG will be to evaluate how proposals by other Work Groups would influence the aesthetic quality of the project.

Mark explained that while fuel load management is not a FERC requirement, SP-L5 was developed to address local and regional concerns related to fires in the project area and public comments that have identified this issue.

## **Study Plan Review**

Due to the fact that implementation plans have not been developed for the Land Use studies, the Work Group decided to review each of the study plans by task to flush out any details that concerned the Work Group. Changes to the text were made as necessary. Major highlights of this process are presented below.

### ***Land Use Study Plan 1 (Land Use)***

The discussion on SP-L1 focused on the status of GIS efforts for the project. Jim Martin (DWR) informed the Work Group that he had received a large inventory list of GIS work products from Northern District, DWR. DWR's Northern District office manages the GIS component of this project. Mark Greenig requested a "data dictionary" for the information DWR already has developed, and Jim Martin responded that he would get a list of available data to the Work Group.

The discussion subsequently addressed whether this study plan would cover all land use issues identified in the public scoping process. The Facilitator indicated that all issues in the "Resource Issues, Concerns, and Comments Tracker" will be considered and will ultimately have some type of identified resolution.

### ***Land Use Study Plan 2 (Land Management)***

The participants reviewed SP-L2 deliverables and schedule. The concepts of "preliminary" vs. "interim" reports was discussed, and it was decided that interim reports will be completed and will serve as check-in points with the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group. In

addition, the schedule dates for this study have been changed due to the Plenary Group's desire to push the study plans forward.

#### ***Land Use Study Plan 3 (Comprehensive Plan Consistency)***

The discussion on SP-L3 focused on the need to have the other Resource Area Managers (RAMs) identify pertinent plans that will need to be analyzed in this study. Mark Greenig further suggested that the RAMs briefly summarize any plan identified; Jim Martin (DWR) will pursue this issue further with the RAMs.

#### ***Land Use Study Plan 4 (Aesthetics)***

Mark Greenig discussed the various agency systems used to analyze aesthetic resources, and indicated that these systems will be used to the extent feasible for lands within the project area that are managed by those particular agencies. The identification of key observation points (KOPs) will be coordinated with the Work Group and the Oroville Field Division. One participant suggested that the KOPs should be related to the proposed changes resulting from the relicensing process. The Facilitator responded that the opportunity to address project-related visual impacts would be available in Year 2, and that coordination with the Recreation Work Group will be valuable in identifying potential and current high-use areas.

#### ***Land Use Study Plan 5 (Fuel Load Management)***

Mark Greenig proposed ground-truthing several areas including Kelly Ridge, as part of this study, and to coordinate with the vegetative mapping efforts to be completed by the Environmental Work Group. The Facilitator inquired as to the extent of CDF efforts on the fuel load management issue. It was concluded that CDF should attend a future Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group meeting and that there needs to be coordination between Departments of Parks and Recreation (DPR) and CDF. Further, it was agreed that a multi-Work Group task force be created and hold a workshop to address this issue; this will be included as a task in the study plan.

#### **Land Acquisition Projects**

The discussion of land acquisition projects focused on a proposed transfer of approximately 6,400 acres of BLM land to the State. Small-scale maps of the proposed land transfer were made available. DPR is interested in acquiring these lands, as are Native American interests in the area. Roger Calloway (DPR) indicated that DPR has already applied for this transfer; however, BLM is seeking assistance with the environmental document required for the transfer, and is looking to integrate the necessary studies for the transfer into the relicensing study plans. DPR supports acquisition of these lands to eliminate in-holding issues with law enforcement, etc. Mark Greenig offered to contact FERC to discuss this matter further from a procedural standpoint.

Several other land acquisition projects were discussed, including potential purchase of the Campbell Hills hang gliding area. This proposal has been noted and added to the potential acquisition list. Jim Martin indicated that all land acquisition projects are premature at this point, except for time sensitive projects such as the BLM transfer.

Jim Martin suggested that all parties interested in land acquisition submit written requests to DWR (Jim Martin) with maps, which will be held on file. At some future time, these requests will be evaluated including a determination on a nexus with the project.

#### **Next Meetings**

Based on the proposed 2002 Land Use Work Group meeting schedule that was agreed to previously, the next Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group meeting will be:

Date: Monday, March 25, 2002  
Time: 6:00 to 10:00 PM  
Location: Oroville (to be determined)

### **Agreements Made**

The Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group agreed to create a fuel load management task force that would consist of, but not limited to, representatives from DPR, CDF, Butte County, Plumas National Forest, and BLM.

The Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group agreed to request that all parties interested in land acquisition projects submit written requests with maps to Jim Martin at DWR.

### **Action Items**

The following list of action items identified by the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group includes a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action, and item status.

**Action Item #LU27:** Obtain a copy of the Butte County Bicycle Plan for inclusion in SP-L3.

**Responsible:** DWR Staff

**Due Date:** March 25, 2002

**Action Item #LU31:** Mail meeting handouts to conference call participants.

**Responsible:** Facilitator

**Due Date:** February 28, 2002

**Action Item #LU32:** Distribute list of available GIS data to the Work Group.

**Responsible:** DWR Staff

**Due Date:** March 25, 2002

**Action Item #LU33:** Request other RAMS to identify pertinent planning documents that will be considered under SP-L3 (Comprehensive Plan Consistency).

**Responsible:** DWR Staff

**Due Date:** June 2002

**Action Item #LU34:** Contact FERC to acquire more details on the potential BLM land transfer in the project area.

**Responsible:** DWR staff and Consultant Team

**Due Date:** March 25, 2002

**Action Item #LU35:** Update Work Group on status of BLM land transfer project.

**Responsible:** DWR staff

**Due Date:** March 25, 2002